

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

The Board convened in the Commissioners' Hearing Room, 6th Floor, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Commissioners Boldt, Stuart, and Morris, Chair, present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Commissioners conducted the Flag Salute.

PUBLIC COMMENT

*Greg Webber*, 19111 NW 67<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Ridgefield, commented about a matter regarding land division and referenced a letter he had given the Board two weeks ago regarding a parcel division. He said a memorandum was given to the Board on November 29<sup>th</sup> in response to that issue from Rich Carson. Mr. Webber stated that he didn't think his issues were addressed in the memo itself. He said that in terms of the land division issue that agricultural clusters and divisions are no longer permitted in the agricultural zoned district, his property is R-10 not AG. Webber provided some history of his parcel. He stated that his property was divided in 1990 and was zoned AG at the time; it changed from AG to R-10 in 1997. He said his property was moved by a court case in 1997 before current code was adopted. He further explained.

*Morris* pointed out that there were 37,000 acres affected by the court case. She said this has to do with a land development application, which is not normally the business of the board unless it gets to an appeal state. She said she thought this was more of a legal determination versus a board determination and asked Mr. Lowry if they should be having this conversation at all.

*Rich Lowry*, Prosecuting Attorney's Office, responded that in his judgment the code was clear in this circumstance so if relief was to be granted, it would have to be granted through an amendment to the code. He thought it was something the Board could appropriately discuss. However, Lowry disagreed that the code is ambiguous.

*Webber* said he didn't believe the code was ambiguous and that it was actually too specific. It doesn't have any room for something outside any boundaries or an exception to a case and he believes his property falls into that category.

*Lowry* stated that the county adopted the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and in implementing regulations the current rules were put into effect and were subsequently slightly modified. He said the rural district zone within this property has a provision in it that specifically addresses previous cluster subdivision and provides that the remainder parcel on a previous AG cluster generally cannot be further divided until it's brought within an urban growth boundary. The rationale for that limitation is that the earlier cluster subdivision, which no longer exists in the AG district, essentially permitted a lot yield of one lot per five acres although you had to cluster them, so that if you currently allowed further division in the remainder lot you would end up with

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

an effective yield of the original parent parcel of greater than one lot per five acres, which would exceed the density permitted in the current rural district. Lowry said the board did amend that provision in the late 90's to allow some further division where the original cluster division didn't yield the maximum density so it would allow—if property were currently Rural 5 and an old cluster division yielded a density of less than one lot per five acres—some additional division. He said his understanding was that the cluster they are dealing with in this case maximized its density so it would not fall within that exception.

*Webber* stated that when his property was divided in 1990 there was a specific statement on the plat as division of section 18.301.090, Subsection H, that the parcel would not be allowed to further divide until such time a change of zone occurs that permits a higher density or different use. The zoning changed in 1997 by a court case.

*Morris* said that Mr. Webber's zone did not change because of a court case, but it changed because the court said agri-forest was not a permissible zone under GMA. That didn't mean he couldn't have gone to R-20; he went to R-10 by virtue of a decision made by the Board of County Commissioners, which was thoroughly discussed through the Planning Commission. She further explained. She stated that this dispute could only be fixed by the Board making a change in the code, or Mr. Webber would have to litigate. She said Mr. Carson, Community Development Director, could advise him about the process.

*Webber* left a copy of his letter.

CONSENT AGENDA

*Boldt* asked for a clarification regarding item 3.

*Steve Duh*, Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation, stated that the agreement was for the design development work to work through the various technical discussions and drawings to prepare for site plan submittal within the County. The current design envelope is the entire 240 acres. The current design considers the off-leash area as an interim use and is at this point flexible with regard to Hockinson School District and negotiations with them for the northeast corner.

*Pete Capell*, Public Works Director, added that discussions are occurring with Hockinson School District and they are considering that site, as well as one other site. Mr. Capell said that if they ended up selecting that site, then the county could make any modifications necessary to the master plan to accommodate them and still incorporate those things into what would be the final design drawings. He said staff would work directly with the school district and then they would instruct the design consultant of what the northeast 40 acres needs to look like.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

*Morris* asked if the contract calls for flexibility in approach to the 40 acres and suggests to the consultant that they do the remainder design with an eye toward the need to relocate at least a part of the dog park.

*Capell* said yes. He said they are asking the school district to work with the county in order to find closure to this so that for permitting purposes it doesn't delay the county's work.

There being no further comment, **MOVED** by Boldt to approve items 1 through 11.  
Commissioners Morris, Boldt, and Stuart voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 247)

PUBLIC HEARING: ROAD VACATION, NE 129<sup>TH</sup> STREET

Held a public hearing to consider the County Engineer's Report on the advisability of vacating the north 13 feet of a portion of NE 129<sup>th</sup> Street.

*Louie Benedict*, Department of Public Works, presented the staff report.

*Stuart* wanted to know if the Engineer's Report had been shown to the applicant and what kind of discussions they had.

*Benedict* responded that he had notified the applicant via email that it was being recommended to be reduced to 10 feet, and the applicant was comfortable with that.

*Don Golden*, Board of Director of the Waters Edge Condo Association, stated that he believed the road vacation would directly affect them. Mr. Golden further described the property. He explained that there is an emergency exit on the western side, which remains locked for security reasons, and they have concerns about keeping and maintaining it. He said they also have concerns related to run-off and any impact it would have on Salmon Creek.

*Stuart* referenced Phase II and 129<sup>th</sup>, which directly connects with that. He wanted to know what the implications would be as far as any kind of access along there.

*Benedict* said the emergency access lies on the southerly 27-foot half-width so it wouldn't be affected by the road vacation and they would still be able to maintain it.

*Golden* also expressed concern about a big box store that was going in and he believed they were planning for the road vacation to enhance it.

*Morris* wanted to know where the applicant's property was located.

*Benedict* said it was north of 129<sup>th</sup> and borders 129<sup>th</sup> Street straight north to 134<sup>th</sup> Street.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

*Morris* asked how much of Rockwell Road is built.

*Benedict* replied that it's all built, but still needs sidewalks and curbs.

[Discussion continued]

*Morris* said she was okay with delaying this for a week.

*Stuart* said he would like to get an answer regarding what the plans are for that road.

*Ali Safayi*, Department of Community Development-Development Engineering, said industrial roads are usually for commercial industrial zones. The difference with the local access roads is the thickness of the asphalt and the rock. Mr. Safayi said the remaining right-of-way would be adequate for the improvements.

*Dean Logsdon*, CLC Associates, 12730 East Mirabeau Parkway, Suite 100, Spokane Valley, representative for Mr. Ossey, addressed Commissioner Morris' question regarding the additional 10 feet. He said the purpose of the road vacation was to achieve consistency with condition A-5 of the Salmon Creek commercial short plat, which was approved in 2003. He further explained condition A-5. Mr. Logsdon stated that he has had discussions with Mr. Benedict about the county's request to change the road classification to industrial and for a 60-foot right-of-way—30 feet on each side—and if they would agree to change their vacation petition from 13 feet to 10. Logsdon said that's fine with them.

*Stuart* requested that they continue the hearing to the following week so he could talk with Mr. Benedict and transportation staff in order to get further clarification.

*Boldt* said the land is deeded to the county and asked if the applicant would have to pay for it.

*Benedict* said no. The applicant is being asked to pay for administrative costs.

There being no further public comment, **MOVED** by Boldt to continue the hearing regarding a Road Vacation of NE 129<sup>th</sup> Street to December 20, 2005, at 10:00 a.m. in the Commissioners' Hearing Room of the Clark County Public Service Center, Sixth Floor. Commissioners Morris, Boldt, and Stuart voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 247)

PUBLIC HEARING: ANNUAL REVIEW/DOCKET

Held a public hearing to consider Annual Review Docket items.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

**CPZ2005-00069 - NE 117<sup>th</sup> Avenue** The property owner is seeking to redesignate and rezone parcel 158435-000 for approximately 9.4 acres from Light Manufacturing (ML) to General Commercial (CH) located near the 6900 block of NE 117<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The Planning Commission recommended **DENIAL** by a 3 to 2 vote.

*Oliver Orjiako*, Department of Community Development, presented. Mr. Orjiako said that staff has reviewed the planning and zoning criteria and took it through the Planning Commission (PC). The PC voted to deny the proposal by a 3 to 2 vote.

*Randy Printz*, 805 Broadway, Vancouver, representative for the applicant, stated that the issues of this case are very similar to the issues they went through the previous Tuesday on the property on the north side of Costco. He said it's industrial to commercial with the same criteria and further explained. Mr. Printz said that in terms of the Planning Commission's vote of 3 to 2 for denial, neither Lonnie Moss nor Jeff Wriston were present that night, which may or may not have made a difference. Printz added that Cary Smith, who was the swing vote, had even stated that he was on the fence. He thought it was fair to say that the PC struggled with this one and it was very close.

*Printz* referenced three overhead maps from 1979, 1990, and 1995 and provided some history. He said the piece located immediately to the south is zoned ML. He illustrated some of uses there and said they weren't uses they would look at and probably identify with either prime industrial or creating family wage jobs, etc. He said the piece they're discussing is really the only remnant piece of industrial from that larger node and everything else has either been changed by the county to primarily a commercial designation or has developed with non-prime industrial sorts of uses. Printz then referred to the Economic Task Force and stated that a number of issues resulted, first and foremost identifying industrial nodes and areas of what were deemed focus public investment areas—areas such as the Port of Vancouver, Port of Ridgefield and Ridgefield Junction, La Center—and this area was not one of those. He said one of the points staff has made is that Highway Commercial is only applied to existing strip commercial and, thus, is not really available as a new designation anywhere; however, Printz said it was inaccurate to say that the Comp Plan only allows the application of this zone to existing strip commercial. He referenced some areas that are commercial nodes that have vacant Highway Commercially zoned land. He said what the Comp Plan does say, which staff has emphasized and he agrees with, is the Comp Plan emphasizes not contributing to existing strip commercial, e.g. not extending or re-doing Highway 99—that is essentially what the policy is designed for. He further explained.

Printz said that in terms of the Comp Plan criteria specifically, there are a couple or three that says that you must meet these criteria before you can convert industrial to non-employment lands—which is not technically what they are doing—and one of them is that it can't be brought up to prime. From a strict definition, technical standpoint, the Comp Plan defines prime

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

industrial land as being a site that is 10 acres or greater, and this site doesn't meet that because it is a bit under that. The second is that non-industrial is more appropriate, and in this case there are other uses that this piece of property is better suited for from the standpoint of jobs creation, economics. The third has to do with the replacement sites and the no net loss. As far as the question of whether or not you have to meet all three criteria or just one or the other, and the board has decided that only one is necessary. Even if they needed to meet all three criteria, Printz said he believed they did under the language of the Comp Plan through the emergency ordinance that changed 134 acres of BP to ML.

*Boldt* said this piece has been zoned that way for awhile and as far as he can remember, there's always been a "For Sale" sign since probably '79. He wanted to know if there were people who wanted it should the zoning be changed.

*Printz* said yes. He said they have had substantial interest from larger format retailers and folks who would put a substantial commercial enterprise in the area.

*Mayor Paul Dennis*, Cascade Planning Group, 1427 NE Fifth Avenue, Camas, stated that as part of the applicant's due diligence on this parcel they hired him to look at the economics of the parcel. As discussed at the previous hearing, there are a lot of similarities to the 88<sup>th</sup> piece that was granted. Mr. Dennis said when they did the initial analysis in February, they used the vacant buildable lands model that was available at that time and what they found in parcels 5 acres or greater is that there is only about 110 acres. He said they looked at the purchasing power within the county to try and get a sense of net demand and supply and what they found was that there was a shortage and they would actually need about 290 acres of large size for large format retailers. Dennis further explained that in looking at the population projections adopted under the 2004 plan, there's another 275 acres of large commercial properties that are needed to meet that demand over time. That leaves a net shortage of approximately 455 acres just for large format retailers. He stated that this parcel alone would yield about 230 jobs if it were changed to commercial, and about \$27 million worth of sales. It would yield more tax benefit to the county as commercial versus industrial. He further explained. He said as commercial they would get a higher and better use out of it.

*Printz* added that at the Planning Commission a lot of the discussion centered around transportation and he thought where they have landed with staff is that because of the wide array of uses that could be put in industrial or commercial, depending on what assumptions you make. On balance, he thought it was fair to say that it would be more likely that there would be slightly higher traffic impacts locally at the access point with commercial than industrial. However, he also thought there would be systemic transportation benefits. He said there is more traffic on Andresen and 88<sup>th</sup>, but pointed out that the same people who are going to the Costco there are the same ones who used to drive across the river to the Costco near the airport, and so those trips are no longer on the road. Printz said he thought the same would happen in this case. He

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

said whether it was industrial or commercial, there was the requirement to meet concurrency tests and transportation standards at the time of development review.

*Stuart* said as far as transportation, SR-503 and 117<sup>th</sup> has been determined by WSDOT to be a major hindrance to the county during a growth plan. He asked for some assurance that they wouldn't be shooting themselves in the foot with later industrial development by making this change.

*Printz* pointed out a few things: that the area on SR-503 that WSDOT has the most trouble with is the area north, between Battle Ground and Orchards, and particularly north of the Padden and 119<sup>th</sup>; the TIF that would be generated between industrial and commercial on this site was a million dollar delta, or probably more; and concurrency wise, an industrial development by virtue of the price per square foot of that dirt does not have the ability to buy the fix. So to the extent that there are transportation issues, in making it red as opposed to blue they would actually be bringing another asset to the table that has the ability to fix it.

*Stuart* said this was 9.4 acres and if he recalled the Fred Meyer in Salmon was 12 acres—was that correct?

*Orjiako* said that was probably about right.

*Stuart* said they're talking about a large format retailer and a lot of them require a minimum square footage to be successful. He wanted to know roughly how many square feet of retail they were talking about within this parcel.

*Dennis* said he thought it was a total of about 100,000 square feet.

*Morris* said she assumed this would have to be right in/right out, which means you couldn't exactly draw people from the west across Padden to make a right-hand turn southbound onto 117<sup>th</sup>, and a left in.

*Printz* said there's a full street that goes up the east side of the property.

*Stuart* said he thought of this as more of a strip versus a commercial node. He said he would appreciate it if steps can be taken to ensure that the aesthetics are good and it's done correctly the first time.

*Morris* added that if they grant the zone change, then the applicant has an opportunity to set a standard. She further explained.

*Printz* agreed.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

[Public comment closed]

There being no further comment, **MOVED** by Boldt to grant the requested zone change for Docket Item CPZ2005-00069, NE 117<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

*Morris* commented that this has been the most troubling of the zone changes. She said they need to either take the issue of no net loss seriously or they need to change the policy. She said they will be discussing changes in the Comprehensive Plan text later in this hearing that actually take Light Manufacturing out of the Employment Center designation. She said she was willing to go along with this only if they are very serious in their re-do about making sure they have made up for the industrial land. She said that when they look at the map later in the afternoon, they need to make sure they're providing for this compensation, that they are providing for their higher jobs goals and that industrial development is a key for them. *Morris* said she always thought one of the major areas in Comprehensive Plan changes is the phrase "substantial change of circumstances." She said the most telling change of circumstances, when they have a zone change request from industrial to commercial that they support, was the change in the property tax limit, which was adopted by the voters and has made financing of local government circumstances different than it was at the time the no net loss policy was written, or the time the 1994 land use plan was adopted. That is the most significant change of circumstances they've seen that prompts zone changes from commercial to industrial, which is unfortunate because it makes us more dependent on sales tax. *Morris* said she made these statements for the record so that she's clear that industrial land remains extremely important, that the issue of family wage jobs remains extremely important, and that they do have a definition for what they say is a family wage job. She said she would go along with the recommendation because they need the sales tax revenue and because people want to be able to shop on this side of the river. Also, because people have been encouraged to shop on this side of the river and so we need to be competitive with the kinds of choices that are available.

*Stuart* said they need to figure out what they want and if what they want is sustainable revenue for the county and good paying jobs for the citizens, he didn't know if industrial was the answer to that. He said he thought it would be a good discussion for them to have.

Commissioners *Morris*, *Boldt*, and *Stuart* voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 247)

**CPZ2005-00066 - Lusk** The property owner is seeking to redesignate and rezone parcels 155968-284 and 155968-276 for approximately 4.7 acres from General Commercial (CH) to Urban Low (R1-6) located on the north side of Padden Parkway at approx. NE 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. The Planning Commission recommended **APPROVAL** by a 5 to 0 vote.



COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

*Orjiako* stated that this was a request from the applicant to change the zoning of this property from Highway Commercial to Urban Low Density Residential or Single-Family that allows for 6,000 sq-ft. lots. He said the property is about 5 acres. He referenced the map and said a portion of the property is already designated and zoned for Single-Family. One of the issues had to do with access and for commercial he wasn't sure where they would take access. He said they recommended approval and the Planning Commission concurred by a 5 to 0 vote.

*Stuart* asked if C-Tran owned parcel near there.

*Mabrey* said they own the property to the south.

*Randy Printz*, 805 Broadway, Vancouver, representative for the applicant, presented. He stated that county staff was in agreement that this should be residential. Mr. Printz said as far as industrial, he agreed with the board's comments regarding industrial and jobs, etc., and said he believed their problem was that they're using old tools in many respects. He said it's no longer true in most cases that the jobs and tax base would come from industrial. He further explained.

*Stuart* wanted to know if there was any opportunity for mixed uses in that area.

*Printz* said no, not much.

[Public comment closed.]

There being no further public comment, **MOVED** by Boldt to approve Docket Item 2005-00066, Lusk. Commissioners Morris, Boldt, and Stuart voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 247)

**CPZ2005-00078 - Amend the Twenty Year Growth Comprehensive Plan Text:** The Comprehensive Plan text document was last revised September 2004. Since that update, a number of inconsistencies have been identified in the document. This amendment serves as a post adoption correction to the comprehensive plan text. A file containing the adopting ordinances and text document can be viewed in the Long Range Planning Division. The Planning Commission recommended **APPROVAL** by a 6 to 0 vote. The Planning Commission recommendations **did not** make the deletions set out at 1.2, 1.3, correcting Table 1.2, **not** making the deletions set out in 1.4, 1.1.15 and 3.2.13 in the staff report.

*Orjiako* explained that the yellow highlighted areas in the board's handout were the ones that the Planning Commission recommended for a change. He further explained. As far as the no net loss policy, on page 8 of 8, the Planning Commission is recommending—consistent with staff's proposal—that they change the “or” to “and.”

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

*Morris* asked if the numbers reflected the new forecast.

*Orjiako* responded that this was consistent with the 2004 plan. He said as they go through the current process they would be updating the plan text in its entirety and make sure it's updated to be consistent with the current board projections.

*Morris* wanted to know why these changes weren't made in 2004.

*Orjiako* said that at the time the board had staff working with 1.83% throughout the process and towards the end it changed to 1.6%.

*Morris* said she didn't feel comfortable about adopting the population forecasts, but would do it if that's what she had to do. She said they would be adopting a plan hopefully prior to the annual review process coming through and their Comprehensive Plan policies need to be consistent at the time they adopt the plan with the plan they're adopting. So from a timing perspective, she wanted to know if they could move the changes in the Comprehensive Plan text through the process much earlier than they have done it this year so they have them already in place by the time they adopt a map, hopefully in September.

*Orjiako* said they could do that at the direction of the board. He said this was not time-sensitive. If the board decided not to adopt this, it would be fine with staff. However, it would be appropriate for them to have a base to begin the current process.

*Morris* asked Mr. Lowry to comment.

*Lowry* stated that from a legal standpoint he didn't think it made any difference whether they tried to put these numbers in to try and make the 2004 plan internally consistent, or wait until they have the numbers for the update to be completed next year. He said if there was any kind of legal challenge, the most that would happen is that they would get a hearings board remand to fix the numbers. Lowry said there was nothing in these numbers that has direct application as policy. He said there was a couple of provisions that directly relate to policy and those probably have a more time-sensitive value to them. One of them is the issue of being able to implement EC with industrial and that is something the board has taken advantage of, which is clearly an error in the plan. He further explained. He said that given what's happened with the BP zoning issues, it's fortunate this error was in the plan because it's given the board the flexibility to try and deal with it. Whether or not this is time-sensitive, he thought it could be argued either way. Lowry said the other substantive one that deals with policy is the no net loss, which the board has just heard to a convergence of industrial to commercial and in a sense taken advantage of what was an error in putting an "or" rather than "and" in that no net loss policy.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

*Stuart* said he looked at this as bookkeeping. As far as the no net loss issue, he said he was looking forward to having a more robust discussion, but he was okay with the changes for this year. He said it seemed to be consistent with the intent of what was, and what will be is still up for grabs.

*Lowry* noted that the City of Vancouver uses an “or” and they allow a conversion where there’s a determination that a different designation is more appropriate without back-filling.

*Morris* said it didn’t seem internally consistent for them to add the word “and” to tighten this language and then blow it up next year. She agreed with Commissioner *Stuart* that it did need to be blown up and he raised very good issues and if family wage jobs is their issue, those aren’t just associated with what they traditionally call manufacturing. She said her preference for this would be not to put the “and” in and leave as is. She said she felt inconsistent in using this language five minutes previously and changing it now.

*Lowry* said that was a legitimate unease because unlike other land use applications, a rezone is not subject to the vested rights doctrine and so if they were to make a policy decision that the “and” should be an “or,” that policy decision should be applicable to any pending zone change request.

*Morris* said she was thinking they just take out the amendment of “and” and leave it written as it is. She asked if they needed to instead add the word “or”?

*Lowry* said no, the “or” is what’s currently in the code, although it doesn’t show it. So they would simply do nothing.

*Orjiako* said that was acceptable to them.

*Morris* suggested they leave it as it’s written. She asked about the deletion of Light Manufacturing.

*Orjiako* stated that they would not recommend deleting the implementation of the ML within the EC designation, so the shaded area would remain.

*Lowry* said this was one where the board, through the emergency process, has been making changes back to ML and so it probably makes sense to leave this one also to be fully resolved at the conclusion of the update.

*Morris* referenced page 4, under Rural Center, the Commercial. She said the Planning Commission recommended allowing CR-1 and she wondered what the significance of that was.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

*Orjiako* said he thought the significance was that in the Rural Commercial district, there is a distinction between CR-1 and CR-2—one is within the rural center boundary and one is outside the rural center boundary.

*Lowry* emphasized that CR-2, which is outside of rural centers, is not intended to be an allowable zone to put into rural as a general proposition. It's only intended to be placed where you had pre-existing commercial as a recognition of a pre-existing commercial.

*Morris* clarified that they would be taking a motion to adopt the Planning Commission recommendations for the text changes in the Comprehensive Plan, with the exception of Policy 9.3.5 on page 8, and tableling 1.4.

There being no further public comment, **MOVED** by Boldt to adopt the Planning Commission recommendations on changes to the Comprehensive Plan text, with the exception of one change on Policy 9.3.5, and tableling 1.4. Commissioners Morris, Boldt, and Stuart voted. Motion carried. (See Tape 248)

*Orjiako* noted that they would wrap up with the Camas School District [Capital Facilities Plan] on December 20, and they would also work on bringing the resolutions to the board.

COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Commissioner communications.

*The Board of Commissioners adjourned and convened as the Board of Health*

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

CONSENT AGENDA

There being no public comment, **MOVED** by Boldt to approve item 1. Board members Morris, Boldt, and Stuart voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 248)

BOARD OF HEALTH COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Board of Health communications.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

*Adjourned*

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

**2:00 P.M. PUBLIC BID OPENINGS**

Present at bid opening: Rebecca Tilton, Board of County Commissioners Office; and Priscilla Ricci and Allyson Anderson, General Services-Purchasing Department

BID OPENING 2426

Held a public hearing for Bid Opening 2426 – Exhibition Hall Acoustical Upgrade. Allyson Anderson, General Services, opened and read bids and stated that it was the Purchasing Department's intention to award Bid 2426 on December 20, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., in the Commissioners' Hearing Room of the Clark County Public Service Center, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor. (See Tape 248)

BID OPENING 2427

Held a public hearing for Bid Opening 2427 – Annual Fresh Produce. Allyson Anderson, General Services, opened and read bids and stated that it was the Purchasing Department's intention to award Bid 2427 on December 20, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., in the Commissioners' Hearing Room of the Clark County Public Service Center, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor. (See Tape 248)

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Betty Sue Morris, Chair

Marc Boldt/s/  
Marc Boldt, Commissioner

Steve Stuart/s/  
Steve Stuart, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Louise Richards/s/  
Clerk of the Board

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS  
DECEMBER 13, 2005  
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

rt